



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"And the sons of Joseph which were born to him in Egypt were two; all the souls belonging to the house of Jacob הַבָּאִה (perfect) Egypt were seventy." It is hardly conceivable to me that here we can have simple vacillation; the two words come far too closely together. May not the following two points of meaning underlie this difference? First, הַבָּאִה in v. 26 views the entering Egypt as an event in process—*who were entering*, but the הַבָּאִה in v. 27 as an event completed,—*who entered* or *had entered*; v. 27 finally closes the statement and regards the journey as over. Secondly, Joseph and his two sons were *in* Egypt; they had had no part in this. Thus they could not be spoken of as *entering* Egypt now. The most that could be said was that they in a sense, as members of the family of Jacob, *had* entered Egypt—and that is what is said.

Do all the other cases of "inconsistency" admit of this explanation?

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hartford, Conn.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן

The בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן of the original text of the Old Testament is uniformly represented in the English Revised Version by "Beyond Jordan." (In the so-called Authorized Version we find no less than four different renderings—"Beyond Jordan," "On this side Jordan," "On the other side Jordan," and "On the side of Jordan.") What is the precise meaning of the Hebrew phrase? Does it necessarily call up in the mind a picture of the river Jordan flowing between the territory referred to and the speaker? Is it true, as has been asserted, that the parts of the Pentateuch in which it occurs were "evidently written by one who was *this side* Jordan, and therefore written after the death of Moses, and after the taking possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites," and that "Moses, or any other author in his age, certainly could not have expressed himself in this way so long as he himself was on the eastern bank"? (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. xlii, xliii, says, "The use of the phrase . . . for the country *east* of Jordan in Deut. 1:1, 5; 3:8; 4:41, 46, 47 . . . shows that the author [of Deuteronomy] was a resident in *Western* Palestine.")

An examination of the passages in which the words are used will give a decisive answer to these questions. We will confine ourselves to Deuteronomy and Joshua, it not being necessary to take into consideration the solitary pair of instances found in the preceding books (Gen. 50:10, 11) nor to pass into the later literature.

Within the limits stated בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן is found twenty-two times. (We take no account of somewhat similar expressions.) It points to (1) the *east* side of the Jordan while the speaker is, or is represented to be, on the *east* side in Deut. 3:8; Josh. 1:14, 15, and, if we admit the claims of Mosaic authorship, in Deut. 1:1, 5; 4:41, 46, 47; (2) the *west* side with the speaker on the *east* side in Deut. 3:20, 25; 11:30; (3) the *east* side

with the speaker on the *west* side in Josh. 2:10; 7:7; 9:10; 12:1; 13:8; 22:4; 24:8; and (4) the *west* side with the speaker on the *west* side in Josh. 5:1; 9:1; 12:7 and 22:7 k'ri. In the first of the Deuteronomic addresses attributed to Moses the author in a single chapter uses the phrase to indicate the eastern side (Deut. 3:8) and the western side (vs. 20 and 25), and in the second address Gerizim and Ebal are located **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** (Deut. 11:29, 30). Not only when dismissing the two and a half tribes to whom had been assigned the east Jordanic conquests did Joshua refer to the land of their possession as "beyond Jordan" (Josh. 22:4), but also before he had ever crossed the river he twice spoke of their property as **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** (Josh. 1:14, 15). Passages in the Book of Joshua evidently written on the west side of the stream, and some of them at least several years after the crossing, refer to the west side as **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן**.

There is only one rational explanation of these facts. At the time when the records which we are examining were composed **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** was not limited to a region *beyond* the river from the speaker, nor had it become the technical geographical term for the territory east of the Jordan. It could be employed of land on either side of the river, and the person using it might be on the same side as was the district he had in mind or on the other. It is evident that back of the phenomena noticed must be such an intrinsic latitude of meaning and not the carelessness of a writer who attempted to antedate his production. The authors of Deuteronomy and Joshua were not imbeciles—their writings prove that, whoever they were—and they could not have been guilty of such bungling work as would have to be attributed to them, if in the common speech of their day **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** involved the idea of the English word "beyond."

The result already reached is confirmed by a further examination of the passages in question. We find that in every instance the particular application of the phrase is indicated by some means outside of itself. Of the fifteen places referring to territory on the east side, "toward the sunrising" (**מִזְרַחָהּ** and **מִזְרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ**, **מִזְרַח שֶׁמֶשׁ**, **מִזְרַחָהּ שֶׁמֶשׁ** respectively) is added in four (Deut. 4:41, 47; Josh. 1:15; 12:1), "eastward" (**מִמִּזְרָחָהּ**) in one (Josh. 13:8), and geographical data in at least half a dozen others, while in the few that remain historical references leave no doubt as to the region intended. In the case of the seven passages where the west side is pointed to, the fact is shown in Josh. 5:1; 12:7 and 22:7 by the addition of "westward" (**יָמָה**), in Deut. 11:30 by "behind the way of the going down of the sun" (**אַחֲרֵי דֶרֶךְ מְבוֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ**) in Josh. 9:1 geographically and in Deut. 3:20 and 25 by the immediate context. The authors appear to have taken pains to prevent all ambiguity.

Thus we see that **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** means simply "in the Jordan district" or "in the region through which the Jordan crosses"—"on the side of Jordan" King James' Version renders it in Josh. 5:1—without limitation to either the right or the left bank, and not *per se* that territory

which can be reached only by crossing the Jordan. There is no evidence of a contrasting of the two sides such as would of itself imply the residence of the writers in Palestine (*cf.* Driver, *op. cit.*, p. xliii). The children of Israel had long been dwelling in a land of which it has been said that the Nile is Egypt. There a single stream flowed the whole length of the country and imparted fertility to a strip along either side. Its peculiarities and its relation to the very existence of the nation gave it prominence. It is therefore a very natural thing to find the whole of the Israelites' new possessions spoken of at the time of the entrance into Canaan as the region of another river, עבר הירדן.

TOWERHILL (Guttenberg P. O.), N. J.

W. SCOTT WATSON.

JEREMIAH 5:8.

In Jeremiah 5:8 we read:

סוסים מוזנים משכים היר. איש אל אשת רעהו יצהלו.

For מוזנים the *Keri* has מִיִּזְנִים. The Authorized and the Revised Versions translate: "They were as fed horses in the morning; every one neighed after his neighbor's wife."

As to מוזנים, the *Keri* (and the Eastern *Kethib*) מִיִּזְנִים indicates that the derivation from זון is not after the sense of the Massoretes, who obviously have in mind a verb יזן of which both forms muzanim and m'yuzzanim can be derived, the former being participle Hoph'al, the latter, participle Pu'al. This, however, forms no practical difference, since the verba *Ayin Vav* and *Pe Yod* interchange (as יעץ and יזן). The Talmudic זון means "to provide, supply," especially with the necessities of life; in the Pi'el its meaning has a wider scope: "to outfit, decorate"; "to gird, arm, equip"; and זִיָּן means "armor, steel." The root יזן is found in Talmudic literature only twice (to my knowledge). In *Pesikta Rabbathi*, ch. 27-28 (p. 133b, ed. Friedman), we read: "and they [the girls of Jerusalem] neighed after them [the young men], like susim m'yuzzanim, as we read (Jer. 5:8)," etc. This passage, of course, throws no light on the meaning of our word, as it is merely borrowed from Jeremiah. But in *Babli Gitṭin*, p. 67a, we are told that Isi ben Judah, in characterizing various Tannaim, called Rabbi Jishmael מִיִּזְנִית a well-assorted shop (store), or, as Arukh has it, "a shop decorated with all kinds of goods." There is a variant recorded מִיִּזְנִית (from זון) which allows of the same interpretation. Applying this meaning of יזן or זון to horses, and keeping in mind that זִיָּן is "armor," there is no difficulty in rendering susim muzanim or m'yuzzanim with "equipped" or "trapped horses."*

But what is משכים? That it cannot mean "in the morning" is certain, neither grammar nor sense justifying such a rendition. The

* LXX. in translating our word with ἀγελαμαίς had obviously in mind the root זנה, from which מוזנים is an impossibility. Other etymological attempts may safely be ignored in view of the well-established meaning of our word from post-biblical usage.